

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

CHARLES PARKER,	:	
Petitioner,	:	CIVIL ACTION
	:	
v.	:	
	:	No. 17-2837
PA PAROLE BOARD <i>et al.</i>,	:	
Respondents.	:	

ORDER

AND NOW, this 29th day of March, 2018, upon consideration of Petitioner's Writ of Habeas Corpus (Doc. Nos. 1, 6, & 7), Respondents' Opposition (Doc. No. 11), Petitioner's Reply (Doc. No. 12), the Report and Recommendation of U.S. Magistrate Judge Marilyn Heffley (Doc. No. 13), Petitioner's Objections (Doc. Nos. 17 & 18), and the state court record, it is hereby **ORDERED** that:

1. The Report & Recommendation (Doc. No. 13) is **APPROVED** and **ADOPTED**.
2. Petitioner's Objections are **OVERRULED**.¹
3. The Petition is **DISMISSED** with prejudice.
4. There is no probable cause to issue a certificate of appealability.²
5. The Clerk of Court shall mark this case **CLOSED** for all purposes, including statistics.

BY THE COURT:

S/Gene E.K. Pratter
GENE E.K. PRATTER
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹ Magistrate Judge Heffley thoroughly addressed Petitioner's arguments and correctly recommended denying Mr. Parker's petition for habeas corpus because (1) this court has already rejected Mr. Parker's argument that he has been improperly required to complete sex offender training as a precondition for his parole and (2) his due process claims are meritless. Petitioner objects to the Report and Recommendation, raising substantially the same arguments that he has raised in his prior filings in this matter. Therefore, for the reasons ably outlined by Magistrate Judge Heffley in her Report and Recommendation, the Petition must be denied.

² A certificate of appealability may issue only upon "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2). A petitioner must "demonstrate that reasonable jurists would find the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims debatable or wrong." *Slack v. McDaniel*, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); *Lambert v. Blackwell*, 387 F.3d 210, 230 (3d Cir. 2004). There is no probable cause to issue a certificate in this action.